

2962
M^r. Robert Calder's
VINDICATION

OF HIS

SERMON

Preach'd *January 30, 1703.*

From the Malice and Ignorance of an Anonymous, Obscure, and avowed Enemy, who published some few Notes thereof.

----- *Nunquamne reponam?* Juv.



EDINBURGH,
Printed in the Year, M. DCC. III.



Mr. Robert Calder's *Information to the Reader of his Sermon Preach'd on the 30 of January, 1703.*

BEING earnestly importun'd by a Brother to Preach for him in his Meeting-house on the 30 of *January, 1703.* That being the Anniversary day of Humiliation, for the horrid Murder of King *Charles the 1st.* (whom the General Assembly in *August 1639*, call'd Gods Vice-gerent on Earth, and the offspring of 107 Kings, in their Supplication to the secret Councill) I thought my self obliged in conscience, to render the Principles of *Rebellion* in general, and that Accusious fact in particular, odious to all that own the principles of the Christian Religion; because it is an Eternal Reproach upon our Nations, which ought earnestly
to

to pray to God, that (when he makes in-
 quifition after Blood) he may not lay this
 fin to our Charge: and that the principles
 (by which this Tragical Murder and un-
 paralleled Villany was acted) may be root-
 ed out of thofe who maintain the lawfull-
 nefs of the Deed, and of acting the fame
 game over, when occafion offers: others
 again, though they profefs that they ap-
 prove not of the Treatment which the Roy-
 al Martyr mett with, yet they border as
 near to the Principles of the Actors, as the
Deifts do upon the Tenets of the *Atheifts*.

It's ftrange to think how both parties,
 who have had a hand in this cruel murder,
 fhould avouch the Scripture for the rule of
 their Faith and Manners, in which they
 may find how Sacred the Perfons of Kings
 are, how they are called *Gods* themfelves
 and the *Lord's Anointed*, and yet think it
 lawful to embrue their hands in their blood:
 It is alfo ftrange to acknowledge that the
 King is *Supreme*, and yet to be account-
 able to his Inferiors, or to have any Co-or-
 dinat with Him.

Whoever obferves the Rules and Canons
 of the Gospel, fhall clearly find, that Chrift
 Jefus never advanced his Kingdom with
 balls of Canon, nor bullets of Guns, nor
 did

did he ever breed his Disciples to fight his cause, with Pistols or Muskets. And if some be so critical, as to answer, that such warlike weapons were not in Christ's time, but that the Sword was, and he Commanded them *to sell their Coats and buy a Sword*, 22 *Luke* 36 38. It can be replied very easily that the Author of our Religion told them, *It is enough*: And when there was occasion of Fighting for Christ, He himself discharged the very drawing thereof in his quarrel, so that we may safely conclude that his injoyning his Disciples to get Swords at that time, when he told them of the Extremity he was to meet with, was not that they should fight, for him, but that they should not fight, even when their Master's person was in hazard: and our Blessed Saviour would have the Doctrine of Meekness and Patience reduced to Practice, which before he taught and recommended to his Disciples: The exposition that some put on the former words, overturns the whole Gospel of Christ; the design whereof is to sweeten the sourness, and to tame the wildness of our Natures: but the Carnal gloss that Men put on it, will serve to justify the principle of Revenge, whereas the meaning is, *prepare your selves*

selves for extremitie, it is a Proverbial speech, & our Saviour's saying (when his Disciples told him, *there were two Swords*) *it is enough*, signifies not that two Swords were sufficient; for such an exposition, will not make good construction in the Original. The meaning then of these words, *it is enough*, is, enough of that discourse, or, *no more of that*, &c. But now in our days, and in a corner of our Nation, there is a sett of Men that give out themselves to be Christ's zealous Disciples, and to fight for his Kingdom, and to have great store of carnal Weapons ready for that purpose, Whether these Gun-disciples of Christ have fought against the *Principalities and Powers of Darkeness*, as much as they have done against Kings and Princes on Earth, God knows. But this I am sure, that the first kind of fighting is that which our Saviour enjoyns: And neither He, nor his Disciples, nor the primitive Christians ever treated Heathen Princes, as Men now a Days treat Christian Kings; whether they expect the approbation of *well done good and faithful servants* for advancing Religion with Fire and Sword, I shall not dispute, but I am sure the first Christians did propagat Christ's Kingdom with the
Sword

Sword of the Spirit, and not with the Spirit of the Sword: Fighting the L O R D's Battle, with carnal Weapons, may look like the legal Spirit in the *Old Testament*, but not like the Spirit of the Gospel of our Saviour, who discharged his Disciples to *call for fire from Heaven*, or to draw a Sword in His quarrel; because He sayeth himself in the 9th. Chap of *Luke*, V. 54. *He came not to destroy mens lives, but to save them*: The Divinity which our Saviour taught is neither Barbarous nor Bloody: We know that the Cruelty of the *Spaniards* begot a hatred of the *Christian Religion* in the *Americans*.

We cast up to the Papists, that their Principles are Bloody and Cruel, and They tell us that no Popish Nation ever brought their Kings to the Scaffold, as Protestants have done: We must confess that all that go under the name of Protestants, are not free, nor innocent of this Execrable Murder; but let them bear the blame who own the principles by which this Villany was acted: and who they are, shall appear in this my Vindication of my Sermon on the 30th. of *January*; some fragments whereof have been lately published in Print, by some obscure and malicious person, who conceals his

his name, albeit he be doing service to the Presbyterian interest. I know not why he should conceal himself, when I am not upon a Levell with him, and he needs not fear Punishment; but I find, that he *that doeth evil, hateth the Light*; for he professes no less in his Preface, that he published these notes, to beget an hatred in his party against the Episcopal order in general, and my Person in particular; I can easily Digest this wrong, for I suffered many more in my time; It is enough to me, that he himself professes, that he is no less than a malicious Enemy, for truly he hath not published either my method, or my matter, nor one Paragraph has he Printed to purpose: besides he hath pitifully mangled the sense & Sentences of what he has Printed, partly out of Ignorance, partly out of Senselessness in Hearing, but mostly out of Malice, which is the worst Character that can be given of a man: for he that did this piece of Injustice to me, would think it service done to God to Murder my person if it lay in his power; but God preserve us from the malice of our Visible and Invisible Enemies: I think my self obliged by the principles of self-defence to say something in my own Vindication: I am glad
that

that many of my Hearers were Persons of Sense and Honour, and can attest that he has not published the half of what I said but he hath falsified several things that I did say. He is that Ingenuous as to tell that he wrote not all I said, and I profess he has Printed what I said not, and for his writting some Notes from my Mouth he calls himself *Midwife* to my Child : for which cause, I shall call him *Mr. Midwife* for distinction's sake; And examine his Epistle to the Reader, which here I set down word by word, as he himself caused Print it.

Mr. *Midwife's* Epistle to the Reader prefixt to the Notes he Printed out of Mr. *Robert Calder's* Sermon on the 30th. of *January 1703.*

Curiosity, which is a strange Passion in the Mind of Man, prevailed with me (though somewhat against my Inclination)

tion) to go and hear Sermon upon the 30th of January last, and providence over-ruling, determin'd me to go to Mr. Caddel's Meeting House, where I heard and wrote from his Mouth the Notes of this his following Preachment, which when I heard them, never thought that they should have com'd to Light; but after I had Read them over to some Friends and Gentlemen, they advised me to put them to the Press, that the World may see and know what men he and those of his Faction are, and how dangerous it is to receive them unto Communion with the present Established Government and Ministry. And if the Preacher think there be any thing Material either added or taken from the same, let him do himself the Favour to make publick his Sermon as he Preached it; which I am sure will not want the foresaid Effect. I with great Reluctancy condescended to the desire of these Gentlemen to be the Mid-wife of bringing this once thought, abortive Child into the World, Only I must tell the Reader, that he is not to expect in this Paper every word that Mr. Caudel spoke at the time; the Hearer and Publisher of it, being often times necessitat to draw his hand from the Paper, and fix his eyes upon him, wondring and admiring, to hear such Stage

Stage-like Romantick and Bombast Expressions uttered in a Pulpit; I wish that the reading of these notes, may have as good Effect upon you as they had upon the bearer of it, which was to hate and detaste that Faction and their Government for ever; That you may seriously consider the Matter, is the desire of

A Well-wisher of the Truth.

Mr. Calders Animadversions on Mr. Mid-wifes Epistle to the Reader.

MR. *Midwife* professes that it was *Curiosity* that led him to hear an Episcopal Minister on the 30th Day of *January*: So it was not to join in Worship, nor to hate the Principles and Practices of *Rebells*, that was his motive: If in this he has observed our Saviour's Rule, *Take heed how you hear*, I leave him to be excused or accused by his own Conscience: for he says that *It was somewhat against his Inclination*: Now this was because he thought it either Lawful or Unlawful; If he thought

it Lawful to hear an Episcopal Minister, then he did that which was lawful, against his Inclination: If he thought it Unlawful, then he committed sin against his Inclination; but two things (he professes) moved him to come: 1st. His *Curiosity*; 2^{dly}. *Over-ruling Providence determined him.*

Now this Curiosity of his was moved in him, by God, or the Devil, or himself? If by God, then his Inclinations were sinful, to gainstand the motions of God, and it is sin to continue in these Inclinations of not hearing Episcopal Ministers: If his Curiosity was from the Devil than his Inclination was good to be against the Devil, and yet he suffered the Devil to prevail against his good Inclination.

If his Curiosity be from himself only, then it is a self-moving Principle, and so his Inclination against his Curiosity, was neither against God nor the Devil; but meerly against himself: and if he himself, was against himself; no wonder though he should be against an Episcopal Minister: Self against Self, is a Man that is not himself; and that's the plain description of a Distracted or Mad man: And Cato tells us, that, *he can agree with no Man, who is at Variance with himself.* *Con-*

Conveniet nulli qui secum diffidet ipse.

But then over-ruling *Providence* determining him, will answer for all: he could do no otherways, his Inclinations were over-powered, by *Providence* that determined him to come, to hear a Minister whom he thinks unlawful to hear, and to hear him on a Subject which, he thought, was unlawful to Preach, and upon an anniversary Day, which, he thought, was unlawful to keep: *Providence* is as good a pretence for Theeves and Robbers, to carry them to a place where they may have success in spoiling Men of their Goods, and taking that which they have no Right to, to provide for their Families, as Mr. *Midwifes* curiosity to go to hear Mr. *Calder*: but we should know, that, *Law* is the Rule for the Government of our actions, and not *Providence*.

In the next place, Mr. *Midwife* (in his Preface) calls the paper he has published, *Notes of Mr. Calder's Preachment*, and yet in the Title page he calls it a Sermon preached on the 30th of *January* by Mr. *Calder*, why he called it Mr. *Calder's* Sermon, and not Notes of his Sermon, was that it might appear to be published by the Preacher himself, and to cheat the Buyers out of their

their Money, of which Trade Mr. *Midwife* thinks neither sin nor shame.

He professes also that he never intended to publish these Notes, and that it was with great *Reluctancy* he did so, but was prevailed with by the Importunity of some Friends and Gentlemen: Now comes in an other reason of what he did against his Conscience and Inclination: before he gave *Curiosity* & over-ruling *Providence* as motives for his coming to hear: and now his reason of publishing these notes is to please Friends and Gentlemen: it was with Reluctancy that *Herod* beheaded *John* the Baptist, but it behooved him to do it to pleasure a Dancing strumpet: now if Mr. *Midwife* with Reluctancy did publish these notes, it is because he thought it very unjust, and because he would not wish others to deal so with his own person or his partie, and in so far he was right, but it was a verie odd reason that prevailed with him to transgress the rules of Justice & Equity, and it was no less than to exasperat the Presbyterians against the Episcopal Order, to keep an eternal Quarrell 'twixt both parties, and to make as wide a gulf between them as is between *Lazarus* & *Dives*: and how this can be reconciled with the rules
of

of loving our enemies, and living peaceably
 with all men, surpasses my skill to deter-
 mine. But the main reason that his prevailing
 friends gave for publishing the notes, was to
 shew how dangerous it is to receive Episco-
 pall men to the presbyterian Government.
 As to that part, I think their Communion
 will never be importun'd with Solicitations
 of that Nature, by many of us, if the
 termes be, *Abdication* of the Monarchy and
Abjuration of Episcopacy: we'l rather chuse
 to live with afflicted Truths, than with
 prosperous Errors, as we have done this
 while bygon, with peace of Conscience,
 and without Disturbing the peace of the
 Kingdom, whatever others think to the con-
 trary: All that Mr. *Calder* desires in his
 own Name and for himself, is, to suffer him
 to Live, and to meet with that Forbearance
 and Condescension that he shew'd to the *Non-*
conformists in his Parish, when it was in
 his power, to cause the Laws be put in ex-
 ecution against them, by giving up a list of
 their Names, which he never did, and
 thereby saved them from Fines and Com-
 pulsion, tho' by Law he was enjoined to
 do it, as the People of his Parish can at-
 test, to this very day, which is little over
 Twentie miles distance from the City of
 Edinburgh.

Mr. *Midwife* is so Ingenious as to tell that he wrote not every word I said: And a pretty Reason he gives, to witt, That he was *necessitat* frequently to draw "his hand from the Paper to fix his Eys upon the Preacher, wondering and admiring to hear such Romantick Stuff out of a Pulpit: A good Apology if he may be believed: But this he tells, to save the Credit and Reputation of his skill in writing the short hand: All I shall say to this, is, that he is a Man singular in his Curiosity, his Inclination, in his pliable humour to his Friends their Counsel, and now he is singular in his wonder and Admiration, to hear Romantick stuff out of a Pulpit: It seems he looks not upon what he wrote and published, as Romantick, for his wonder and admiration interrupted him from writing such stuff: But I find the word Romantick so frequently in the Mouths of the Party as a general censure upon the Sermons of Curats, that I am affraid that some of them may chance into such a Bull, as one who never wanted the word Romances out of his Mouth was reading the 13 Chap. of the *Romans*, and he chanc'd to call it the 13 Chap. of the *Romances*.

Now if all be romantick that I preach'd why should Mr. *Midwife* write that, more than what he has omitted? and not write the half of what I said? But I have good ground to believe that he trusted more to his treacherous Memory, than to his interrupted Penn, for there are such sudden transitions, & Skippings from one thing to another, that he truly makes nonsense of several passages. But no writings can escape this fate, against Ignorance and malice; No not the Scripture it self: For if a mocker should read the half of the 1. Verse of the 12 chap. of the *Revelation*, thus, *and there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a Woman*; and should stop there, and immediately read the 13 verse, he should make Scripture as great nonsense, as Mr *Midwife* has done with a passage of my Sermon, to wit, *he suffered for Liberty against Flattery, for his posterity*. Now the Lord deliver all women with Child from such mangling midwives as this: For sure I am that the Midwives in *Agypt* shew more Religion in saving the *Hebrew Children*, than this pretended Zeal for *Presbytry*, has done to a Christian Minister

But if Mr *Midwife* thinks that restoring ill gotten goods be a Necessary Ingredient in Repentance, he ought to make Restitution

of the Money which he got in the Mothers Name; for truly he has been a very undutifull Cummar.

*Mr. Midwife's Mistakes in
the Notes he has published
of Mr. Calder's Sermon.*

I shall here make it evident in some few particulars, how Mr *Midwife* is guilty of the sin of bearing false witness, both out of weakeness & willfulness, & that to the certain knowledge of persons of honour Quality & Sense; For he breaks periods, & unlinks the reasonings, & disjoins the sentences: In a word, he has not published the halt of what I spoke, nor hath he given a sensible nor faithful account of what he did print. For I took my text from 49 *Gen*: 5. 6. My method was 1. To shew the occasion of the words. 2. To give the Critical explanation. 3. To raise some few observations. 4. To apply all to the dismal Occasion of the anniversary. Lastly, to make some practical Improvements.

In the application, I considered, 1. who
was

was murdered. 2. By Whom. 3. By what means. 4. For what cause. And I spoke something to every one of them, tho not all that I had written, Nor did I intend so to do; But all shall appear clearly in my own edition of the sermon that day.

Mr *Midwife* has truly exposd himself, his advisers and all of his partie (that approve of what he has done) to the Just censure of all Ingenuous and knowing men: I think it neither rashness nor uncharitableness to call them palpably unjust, and notoriously malicious, as I shall make appear in some few instances; First,

He publishes one of the Royal Martyr's Golden Sayings thus, *I see the Devil of Rebellion can put on the garb of the Angel of Light*, Whereas I said, *I see the Devil of Rebellion can put on the Angel of Reformation*.

This was an expression which I had as commonly as any proverb, and how he could write *the garb of the Angel of Light*, for these words, *The Angel of Reformation*, could not proceed but from senselessness, or from a design to pervert the Royal Martyr's words, because he and his partie hate the Memorie of such a Martyr for Episcopacie. In the 9^p. He alleges, that I should have said these words: *They shook of the gown & the Bishops;*
But

But whatever I spoke of Bishops, not one word spoke I of a Gown more than of a Presbyterian Cloak.

In the 11 p: He publishes this expression in my name That, *The Royal Martyr sufferd for Libertie against Flattery for His Posteritie*: Whereas I propos'd the question in the Method. *For what did He suffer?* and I answered, That He suffer'd, for *Monarchy against Anarchie, For the Church (particullarlie the Episcopal) against Heresie and Schism; For antiquitie against Novelty; For the Throne against Usurpation; For Liberty against Slavery; and for the prosperitie of the Nation against the ruin & Miserie thereof.*

Now let men of Integrity and Common Sense, judge what sort of an Informer Mr *Midwife* is, that writes *flatterie for slavery, & posteritie for prosperitie*; and withall, to spill and misplace the whole Period.

There is no Reasoning with Mr *Midwife* but by making a parallel betwixt him and some senseless and ignorant Hearers, mistaking sometimes the connexion, sometimes the sound of an expression, who gave very ridiculous accounts of notes of Preachings. As one who heard a Minister say that *Pontius Pilate was a Governour at Ferusalem*: He told

[21]
told when he went home he never knew what *Pontius Pilate* was before, till he heard the Minister tell it in the Sermon: His Neighbour asked, what was it the Minister said? He answered, that the Minister told, that *Pontius Pilate* was a *Cordiner* at *Ferusalem*.

And another Ignorant, hearing a Minister preach, that *Moses* made an *atonement* for the Sins of the People, He not understanding what *Atonement* signified, told that the Minister said, That *Moses* made an Ointment for the Shinns of the People.

This Ignorance and mistake in them, was pardonable, because it did not proceed from Malice and Hatred of the Preacher. Again in the same 10 page. He puts in *Campbel* for *Camden*, which minds me of one reading the 1 *Job* 1, 2, 3. ver. He begins thus, *There was a Man that dwelt in the Land of Videlicet*. For that word *Videlicet* in the Latin is contracted sometimes viz. And he had seven Thousand Sheep, and three Thousand *Campbels*: for so he read the word *Camels*; and some who heard the Chapter read, said they never thought the *Campbells* were so old.

He mentions another word that I should have spoke in my Sermon: *Blettering*. I
pro-

[22]
profess I never Remember to have heard
such a word, nor had I a word that day that
sounded like it : but this invention is ow-
ing to the Rattling of his Brain, and the
Prattling of his Tongue.

But the most pitiful Blunder that Mr.
Midwife makes, is in the 7 page: where he
alleges that I should have said, that, *the*
Royal Martyr was murdered on the very same
day that Christ was Crucified: Now can it
be supposed that any man that understands
the order and decency, the Fasts and Festi-
vals of a Regular & Rational Church should
ever think that *Good-Friday* fell on the 30 of
January: I told indeed, that it was very re-
markable that the history of *Christ's Passion*
and *Crucifixion* in the 27 of *St. Matthew's*
Gospel, is the second Lesson of the Day, in
which the *Royal Martyr* was murdered,
which the King thought his Confessor had
chosen on purpose for his present case, and
therefore he thanked Doctor *Juxon*; But
the Doctor told him, that it fell in course
to be the Lesson of the 30 of *January*, at
which the King was very much comforted.
I add here to what I said, that this same
Lesson falls out to be on the 29 of *May*;
Let any pick a mystical observation from
it as he pleases; but it's sure, that that
same

same Lesson fell out to be at the Murder of the Father, and the Restauration of the Son.

But I impute *Mr. Midwife's* mistake to his ignorance of a *Liturgie*: It's not unlike, if I had mentioned the word *Liturgy* that Day, but he had written down *Leithargy*, and if I had said as may be seen in the *Calendar*, he would have written, as may be seen at the Earl of *Calendar's* house; and if I had spoken of the *Colled* of the Day, he would have written, I have a *Colick* in my Belly the day. For he has published Twentie grosser mistakes than this in the Notes of my Sermon.

Mr. Midwife is as ignorant of a Rational Worship, as a certain person, who hearing a Minister at a Presbytry exercise on the 11 of the *Heb.* 31. Saying the word *Rahab* sprung from the *Hebrew* root -----

The Hearer, after Sermon, went to the Minister's house, and told him how much he was edify'd by his Sermon that day, and now he was wiser than ever; For, he had read the *Bible* and *Josephus*, but he never knew that *Rahab* sprung out of a Root in the Ground before: and pray you Sir, (says he to the Minister) tell me the name of that Root: at which the Minister smil'd, but at length told him of his mistake.

I shall add one word more in the Vindication of the *Royal Martyr*, as to his framing a Prayer out of Sir Philip Sidneys *Arcadia*, which Mr. *Midwife* relates very confusedly.

I thought indeed it was no fault in the *Royal Martyr* to make use of pertinent Expressions, and good Language, and to suit the same to Spiritual matter, or to make a better use of it, than it was in the Original. No man blames *Samuel Rutherfoord* for borrowing a verse out of the same Romance, and to express the devout Soul's or the Church's Love to Christ, from *Parthenia's* Love to *Argalus*; Thus,

Her Being was in him alone,

And He not being She was none.

But Mr. *Midwife* tells that I said, that *Sam. Rutherfoord* made use of the same Prayer, which is like the rest of his gross mis-informations.

However I think it is no more fault in the *Royal Martyr* to borrow Prose out of *Arcadia*, than it was for S. R. to borrow Verse.

Neither think I, that *Alexander Rose* was to blame for his *Virgilius Evangelizans*, in writing the history of the Gospel out of *Virgils* Verses.

But

But however, as to the Royal Martyr, I find others affirm, that this prayer was foisted in by his Enemies, for it was not in the first edition of his Book.

As for the publishing of my Sermon at Mr. *Midwife's* desire, I promise (God willing) to sett forth all I delivered: & all that I wrote, & I think Mr. *Williamson's* Apology for himself may serve me.

"I am necessitat to offer this Sermon to publick view, for Ill willers, their misrepresenting what was spoken; & Well-wishers, Persons of Honour & Respect pressing me.

I delay the Printing of my Sermon for a short time, because, I hear, that some have exclaim'd very bitterly, against the persons that had the confidence to charge Presbyterians with the Murther: I here promise (if I have been in the wrong to the party) to do them Justice publickly in print and Pulpit, by recanting what I have said, if any Person or Persons shall discreetly answer me to these following Queries: But first I shall tell an expression that Mr. *Midwife* has omitted on this Head, and state the question betwixt us; and then proceed with all the mildness that a Controversie is capable of, without any bitterness or Personal reflexion: Yea I will be well pleased to be convinced of my Error, and not ashamed to retract it.

D,

The

The Case Stated

Whether or not the Presbyterians had a hand in the King's Murder?

The Words of *Salmasius*, the Famous French Presbyterian, are these which I cited on the 30 of January.

Ligarunt Presbyteriani, Independentes immolarunt Sacrificium.

The Presbyterians did bind up the Sacrifice, and the Independents offer'd it.

It is first granted, that Presbyterians were not the Actors. Secondly, it is granted that some Presbyterians call it an *execrable and horrid Murder*, as well as Loyalists do, particularly *the Marquess of Argyle* in his last Speech; also it must be granted that others who plead for Presbytrie, and are Zealots for the Solemn League and Covenant, do Justify the Murther; as the Author of *the Hind let loose*. Now in this case I look upon them as better men, who call it a murther: but let us try, whether or not by the Principles couch'd and imply'd in that solemn League and Covenant, they be more consequential, who avow the Lawfulness of bringing Kings to Death. So

So that we are not to take our measures from the good nature of some, nor the ill nature of others, but from the principles and Practices of the then Triumphant parties : For in reason we cannot call the good Nature of some, nor the ill Nature of others, the Principles of the whole party.

We must therefore take our measures from the Principles and Practices, which the Kirk and State did profess and avow ; I think the Case fairly stated; and accordingly I shall proceed.

Queries proposed, and to be consider'd what partie is to be charg'd with the Murther of *King Charles* the first.

1. Whether it is the partie that did assist the King, with the Hazard of their lives and Fortunes? Or the partie that did resist the King with the hazard of their lives and Fortunes, that should be blam'd for the Kings Murder? And what partie was then

Triumphant in Kirk and State, and made Laws in their Parliaments and General Assemblies, not only without, but even against the Kings consent, and rose in Arms against him, but the Presbyterians in *Scotland* and Independents in *England*?

2. Whether Presbyterians had a hand in the Kings Death or no? the question is whether or not by the avowed principles, maintain'd not only by single men, but even by the Representatives of the Kirk and State, and by virtue of the Oath's impos'd upon the Kings Subjects, not only without his consent, but against his express commands, might they have brought the King to Death? Now if by the principles of the partie a King may be brought to Death, why should some of them call it a Bloody Murder to Execute King *Charles I*? Are they not more Ingenuous that Justify the deed? and who prove that it is Lawful from the Oath impos'd on the Nation, particularly the 4th. Article of the Covenant of bringing all to Condign punishment that oppos'd their methods of Reformation, the King himself not excepted? For if they think their Acts, Statutes and Decisions in Kirk and Parliament, binding and valid whether the King ratifie them or not, and

account them Rebels that oppose their Acts, and think it Lawful to bring Rebels to Death, why may they not bring the King to Death also, who heads that Rebellion, and why by them may he not be term'd the Arch-Rebell?

3. Whether or not by the 3^d. Article of the Covenant do they make the King, but a Conditional King, reserving an absolute power to the Kirk and Parliament, and not owning him further than he gives them their wills, and ratifies their Decisions, tho' against his Consent and Conscience? Did not Presbyterians hereby vow, that they may lay restraints upon his Authority? Take away his Power, disable Himself, Friends, and Adherents, to defend themselves? What security then has a King's Person, when left to the Mercy of those, who openly avow the Lawfullness of Killing him, when the other party think it Lawfull to take away his Power, by which, He could defend his Person? What difference is there betwixt the Lawfullness of Shooting Him in a Field, and the Cutting off his Head on a Scaffold? Or to make his Person the *Butt* of a *Cannon-Ball* in a *Camp*, and his *Neck* the *Butt* of an *Ax* on a *Block*? And is not he who binds up a Man's hands from defend-

defending himself as guiltie of Murder, as well as the Person that Stabbs Him to the Heart with a Murdering Weapon?

4. Is it not the principle of the Presbyterian party to resist the King, and to hinder assistance to him, if he own not their Decisions? For do's not the King's own Declaration publish these their positions in the year 1638.

1. *That the Assembly is Independent either from King or Parliament, in matters Ecclesiastical.*

2. *That it's lawfull for Subjects to Covenant and Combine without the King, and to enter into a Bond of mutual defence against him.*

3. *That an Assembly may abrogat Acts of Parliament, and discharge their fellow Subjects from obedience to them, if they any way reflect upon the Business of the Church.*

4. *Their denying the King's Right of Calling or Dissolving Assemblies, and that they may continue to Sit and Act, notwithstanding of his Majesties expresse order for their Dissolution.*

Now as these were their Principles, so were not the practices of the Partie, most consequential, and naturally following from these Principles?

For was it not the ordinary complaint of the *Covenanters*, that the King made Warr against Kirk and State: And what could this imply, but that the King Rebell'd against his Superiors? and who press'd him to abolish Episcopacy, which, by his Oath, Knowledge, and Conscience he was obliged to defend, but the *Covenanters*? and who were they that gave the Kings Friends the Abominable and Odious Epithets and Characters of *Malignants*, *Traitors*, *Rebells*? And who were they who in their printed Declarations, called the Marquess of Montrose, *Excommunicat Traitor*, *Viperous Brood of Satan*, *Child of the Devil*, &c? What principles did they own who did disgracefully Execute that Noble Marquess, the principal Instrument that appeared for the Royal Interest, and with the history of his own Adventures, did hang the King's Declaration, about his Neck, even when they were treating with the King himself? Or who was it that oppos'd and cryed out against the Dukes Engagement, for endeavouring and attempting to rescue the King's Person? or who made these that did engage, do Pennance in Sackcloth for their going to assist the King? Now then, if Presbyterians did not murder the King's

King's Person, did they not murder his Power, by which (in all Probability) he was capable to defend his Person? And if they did not bring him to the Scaffold, did they not bring him more than half way to it, by delivering him up to the partie that embrued their hands in his Blood?

5. Did the Compilers of the Act of the *West-kirk* understand Presbyterian principles, when they avowed plainly that for 12 Years, before the 50 year of God, they were fighting against the King, as may be seen in the very words of the Act here sett down word by word.

West-kirk the 13 day of
August, 1650.

THe Commission of the Generall Assembly considering that there may be just Ground of Stumbling from the Kings Majesties refusing to Subscribe and emit the Decleration offered unto him by the Committee of Estates, and Commissioners of the General Assembly, concerning his former Carriage, and resolutions for the future, in reference to the Cause of God,
and

and the Enemies and Friends thereof; Doth therefore declare that this Kirk and Kingdome do not own nor Espouse any Malignant party, or Quarrel, or Interest, But that they fight meerly upon their former Grounds and Principles, and in defence of the Cause of God and of the Kingdom, as they have done these Twelve years past: And therefore, as they do disclaim all the Sin and Guilt of the King and of his House so they will not own him, nor his Interest, otherwise then with a subordination to God, and so far as he owns and prosecutes the Cause of God, and disclaimes his and his Fathers opposition to the Work of God and to the Covenant, and likeways all the Enemies thereof: And that they will with convenient speed take in consideration the Papers lately sent unto them from *OLIVER CROMWELL*, and vindicate themselves from all the falsehoods contained therein, especially in those things, wherein the quarrell betwixt us and that party is misstated, as if we owned the late Kings proceedings, and were resolved to prosecute and maintain his present Majesties Interest, before and without acknowledgment of the Sinns of his House and former ways, and

satisfaction to Gods People in both King-
domes.

A. Ker.

13 of August, 1650.

THE Committee of Estates having seen and considered a Declaration of the Commission of the General Assembly anent the stateing of the Quarrell whereon the Armie is to Fight, do approve the same, and heartily concur therein.

Tho. Henderson.

But besides, did not that Committee of the Kirk, some years before send an Act unto several Presbyteries, ordaining all Ministers to preach against the Engagement, under pain of Deposition, and was not that same Committee highly approven of, by the next Assembly? And was it not, on that account that Mr. Andrew Ramsay, and Mr. William Cotuit, and several others were deposed, because they disobey'd the Act of the foresaid Committee, and were threatened with sentence of Excommunication, if they

they offered to uplift their Stipends? And at this time was not John Gillon, an Ignorant Plough-man, set up to be a Preacher? see Guthrie's Memoires, 231 p. &c.

Or what principles were the Parliament in Scotland of, that gave these two orders to their Commissioners at London, First not to treat for the King's Life; or to do any thing that might occasion a National quarrel? vide Guthrie 254 p.

Or did not Mr. Robert Douglass understand Presbyterian principles & the intention of the Solemn League and Covenant, when in his Sermon he has these following words *This may serve to justify the proceedings of this Kingdom against the late King, who in an hostile way sett himself to overthrow Religion, Parliaments, Laws and Liberties?*

8. If it be said that Presbyterians did appear with Protestations for the King, and so they are not to be charg'd with the Murder, May it not be answered, First that it is not the principle of the Community or the partie so to do? And if some did appear when it was too late, and out of their power to help Him out of the difficulties, into which Covenanters did involve Him, in so farr they did Counter-act their Solemn League and Covenant, by which they were

Sworn to maintain the Kings person and Authority, in so far as the King should ratifie their decisions, and defend them in their Principles of Presbytrie, and the Abjuration of Episcopacy, which the King never did; So that if any did make protestations for the King (besides that it was too late) when it was out of their power to help him, in so far they broke their Covenant? For what answer can all the Presbyterians in the World give to the very words of *the Hind let loose*, who page 68 highly approves of the Murder?

Yet (saith he) tho' it was protested before and after the Assembly of the Church of Scotland, out of Zeal against the Sectarians, the Executioners of that extraordinary act of Justice, yet (saith He) it was more for the manner than for the matter, and more for the motives and ends of it, that they oppos'd themselves to it, and resented it; For they acknowledged and remonstrated to himself the truth of all these things, upon which that Sentence and execution of Justice was founded: And when a wicked Association & Engagement was set on foot to rescue him, they oppos'd it with all their might.

Now is not this the very thing that
Loyalists

Loyalists say against the Presbyterians, and did not the Author of *the Hind* let loose understand Presbyterian Principles and practices, as well as any of the Party? yea was he not in this Revolution cheerfully receiv'd into their Communion at St. Andrews, where he had opportunity to corrupt Youth with Principles contain'd in his Seditious and Bloody Book, to wit, the Lawfulness of murdering the King and the Arch-Bishop of St. Andrews; and which wicked Book and principle, the Fraternity never obliged him to Retract, Recant or give evidence of Repentance, for Publishing and defending such Bloody and Murdering Principles, to the Reproach of our Nation and to the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*.

7. Who should understand better than the Royal Martyr Himself, who they were that were the principal Instruments of His Trouble? And is it not evident from His Writings, who they are whom He charges with Rebellion against Him? of whom spoke his Majesty (upon *Uxbridge* Treatie) When he said, *It was a grand Maxim with Them, always to ask something which in Reason and Honour might be denied, that they might have some colour to refuse all that was in other things granted?*

On whom did his Majesty mean in this Expression? they think they cannot set up Christ's Kingdom unless they pull down mine.

And does He not plainly say, That Presbytery is like a young Heir, thinks the Father lives too long, and is impatient to be in the Bishop's Chair, tho' Lay-men go away with the Revenues.

Who was it, that pers'd His Majesty to abolish Episcopacy, albeit by His Oath and Conscience he was oblig'd to defend it?

And here let us consider, whether the King or the General Assembly were in the Right in the controversy of Episcopacy and Presbytry, and this we shall make

The Conclusion.

Whether the King standing for Episcopacy, or the Covenanters opposing it were in the wrong?

If King Charles the first was in an error pleading for Episcopacy, what Church in the

the World was Right for the space of 1590 Years? And if Presbyterians say that their platform or model of Government is conform to Scriptures, then I ask them, how doth their practice and Co-ordination agree with High-Priests, Priests and Levites in the *Old Testament*? and with the Apostles being above the Disciples, in the *New Testament*? and how came the first Christians, the Fathers and the Councils to mistake Scripture Institution, & Apostolick Practice? And how came *Jerom* their pretended patron, and *Calvin* their founder to mistake the true meaning of 1. *Tim.* 4. Chap. 14. *Laying on of the hands of the Presbytrie*, and not to expound it as Presbyterians do now a days? And how came Presbyterians to be more quick sighted than *Jerom* and *Calvin*, and many of the Ancients in this exposition?

2. If Presbyterians tell, that the *Imparitie* and Subordination that our Saviour did institute, of Apostles above Disciples, was but for a time; then I question when was *Imparitie* turn'd into a *Presbyterian* paritie, If they say it was when Schism and Division brake out in the first Age of Christianity, and that according to *Jerom*, and that *Episcopacy* was instituted thereafter, for
take;

taking away of Schism; then will it not naturally follow, that when they left Christ's institution of Imparity, they were at a loss, and therefore (to preserve Unity) they were forced quickly to return to the *Superior and Inferior Order*, and to an Imparity as *Christ Jesus* left it in the *Apostles* above the *Disciples*? And if they say, that *Christ* did not intend, to Continue Church Officers, in these orderly Degrees and distinctions. Then I enquire of them what better ground have they for this assertion, than the *Quakers* have for affirming that there was but a temporarie use for the Sacraments of Baptism & the Lord's Supper? and that the use of them was not to continue so long as *Christ* had a Church on Earth? Have the *Presbyterians* more Scripture, Reason or Antiquity for their opinion against *Episcopacie*, than the *Quakers* have for their's against the *Sacraments*?

3. Can it be reasonably concluded that *Christ Jesus* discharg'd higher and lower Orders among the *Apostles* and *Disciples*, from the 22. *Luk.* 24, 25, 26, verses, *The Kings of the Gentiles exercise Lordships &c.* But it shall not be so with you, but let him that is greatest among you be as the younger? Can we (I say) infer that our Savi-

Saviour from these words did institute an equality and paritie among Clergy men; or rather may we not inferr, the contrary, upon these considerations. 1. That Christ did proportion his *New Testament* constitutions to the *Old*, according to *Jerom*; and was not *Christ King* of his *Church* in the *Old Testament*, where the Clergy consisted of *High Priests Priests*, and *Levites*, as well as he is *King* of his *Church* in the *New Testament*, where the Clergie in all ages and places consisted of *Bishops*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*? 2. Did not *Matthias* succeed to *Judas* in's Bishoprick, not only after our Saviour spoke the former words, but even after *Christs Ascension*? And according to the *Ancients*, was not this *Matthias* one of the 70? And did not then his Succeeding to the place, of an Apostle, from a Disciple, import an higher degree, than he was in before? But 3. Did not the Apostles in their Government exercise Acts of Superiority and Jurisdiction over the Disciples, who had Commission to Preach and Baptize as well as they, and to work Miracles too? For is not this clear from the 6. *Acts* 6. *verse*: where the Apostles laid hands on them, & compare that with 14. *Acts* 8. When *Philip* the Deacon had

Converted *Samaria*, to the Word of God, and Baptized them; they sent (upon the Report thereof) *Peter* and *John* to lay hands on them? So that some things remain'd in the power of the Superior, which the Inferior could not meddle with.

But 4. with what reason can it be said that our *Blessed Saviour*, discharged an inequality or Superiority of Order and Jurisdiction, among *Churchmen* by virtue of the forecited Words: Whereas his Disciples mistaking the nature of Christs Kingdom, Imagin'd that it should be made up of an Earthly Glory, Pomp and Grandeur? and He told them expressly, that his Government was not to be like the *Kings* and *Lords* of the *Gentiles*; But did he hereby discharge an Apostolick or Ministerial Government? Or of one order above an other in the Church? For he supposes a Superioritie and precedency among them, which they should exercise, but not as the *Lords* of the *Gentiles*, when he says, *He that is greatest among you* &c. for had he discharged Superior and Inferior Orders among *Church-men*, He would have said *The Jewish Clergy have a Hierarchy and a Subordination of Officers, or an imparity among them, but it shall not be so with you; let all be*

equal among you, and have no Order above another; But do we not see the Apostles were above the Disciples? & may we not see what power *Timothy* and *Titus* had, who were Apostles (not of immediate mission) but of Apostolick Ordination? And do we not find, according to the Judgment of the Ancients and the Learnedest Reformers, that the *Angels of the seven Churches of Asia* were *Bishops* invested with the highest power, above other Church men? But lastly, what can the words of our Saviour in 22. *Luk.* 26. 27. import, but tho' he appointed some higher and some lower, amongst the first Ministers of the Gospel, yet (by his own example) he Recommended the virtue of *Humility* to the highest and greatest among them? and can it signify more than if we should say, *Let the Archbishop be as humble and lowly, as if he were but the meanest Deacon in his Diocese?*

4. Is not the Quakers argument as good against Mr. *John* and Mr. *James*, or any Mr. of Arts, from these words, *Be not ye called Masters*, as the Presbyterian argument against Lord Bishops is, from 1. *Peter* 5. Chap. and 3. *Not as being Lords over Gods Heritage?* and is it not either great Ignorance or great dissingenuity, to take these

words by the sound, and not by the sense: and to permit the people to understand them against the Honourable Title that Christian Kings, give to the Sacred Order of Episcopacy? And from these words to make it Popularlie Odious? For the word *Heritage* signifies, *Lot* or *Possessions*, as it is frequently used in the *Old Testament*; particularly in the *Book of Joshua*: and so in the days of the *Apostles*, and after, several that turned into the profession of *Christianity*, sold their possessions & goods & mortifi'd them for Pious uses: & what was then consecrate to God, was called the *Lords Heritage*; of which the *Bishops* and *Chief Governours* of the *Church*, were *dispensers* and *Managers*; as we Read in the *Acts*, that men sold their *possessions* and *laid them down at the Apostles feet*: this *Heritage*, being a Common stock for poor Christians, the *Apostle Peter*, desires the *Rulers of the Church* in the 1. *Ep. 5. Chap. 3. v. to feed the Flock*, not only with the word, but also to *Supplie* their *Bodily necessities*: out of the *Common Treasurie*; and in 3. *verss* he desires that *they be not Lords over Gods Heritage*, that is not to be possessors of the *Churches Patrimony*, but to be *Stewards* thereof, giving it out to the use it was intend

ed

ed for. After this clear exposition, with what Impudence should men torture these words, as if they were intended against any Honourable title or esteem, that should be given to the Holy Order?

5. What can be meant by these words of *Jude 11 Verse. And perished in the gainsaying of Corah?* but an Inferior Clergy-man to rise against a superior, as *Corah* being a *Levit*, did attempt to invade the Priesthood and the Mitre of *Aaron*? and does not this plainly hold forth, different orders and degrees under the Evangelical Priesthood or Gospel Ministry, as well as in the *Old Testament*? For how can there be any such *gainsaying*, under the Gospel, if all the Gospel Ministers were equal? Or how could there be such a Sin, as *Corah's*, now a days, if there were not distinctions, Degrees & Orders among Church-men? For if all were equal, how could there be a Superior for an Inferior to rise up against? But (perhaps) here, some may say, that a single person may rise against a Community, or against a Church: and thus the Sin of *Corah* may be committed: For our Saviour sayes, Tell the Church and not tell the Bishop: to which I answer that this Objection will do as great Service, if not greater to the Congregational men, or the Inde-

dependents, as to the Presbyterians: for the meaning is, Tell such a Church, as consists of Officers, that Christ appointed, and if this be *Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons*, then what service can this do a Presbyterian cause? Is it not good sense among the *Jews* to say, tell the *Sanedrim*, or tell the *Jewish Church*; which yet did not consist in a parity of Church men?

6. Had not his Majesty the right end of the Staff, in the debate with the Presbyterians, when he had the Authority of *St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage*, maintaining an order above Presbyter's, in the very sense that we plead for it, against the Presbyterians at this day? as it is made out very Learnedly and solidly, in the *Vindication of the Cyprianic Age*, beyond the possibility of a Rational Reply. And which is offer'd to be made out in a Dispute, before the Learned Laicks of the Kingdom, if allowed by Authority?

Now if Episcopacie was the only Church Government in the 250 year of God, which was an Age of *Miracles, Martyrdome, great Piety and Learning*; & had no *Worldly or Secular Temptation*? and if in *St. Cyprians time*, they guarded against Novelties and Innovations, and had as good Advantages

tages to know what Government was left in the Church by the *Apostles*, as we have to know by History, the Church Government of the Reformation; and if the General Assembly (in that controverſie) had not the Hundredth part ſo much, to ſay againſt his Maſteſty for their cauſe, as he againſt them, then was not his Maſteſty moſt unjuſtly oppos'd, both in his Authority and in the cauſe for which he pleaded ?

Now there being but an Hundred and Fifty years betwixt St. *Cyprian's* being advanced to's Biſhoprick, and the Death of St. *John*, who died in the end of the firſt Centurie; Might not St. *Cyprian* underſtand, and know the Apoſtolick Government from St. *John's* time, as well as we may know the hiſtory of the Reformation? Do we not find ſince this Revolution, that one Mr. *James Ker* of *Grange* in the Pariſh of *Abbot-Rule* in *Teviotdale*, who dyed thirteen years ago, and was a Preacher in King *James VI.* time, lived not farr from the beginning of the Reformation, and the ſaid Mr. *James*, might have convers'd with men in his younger days, that could have told Him, what they ſaw with their Eyes, at the beginning of the Reformation, in the days of their Minority?

Now

Now, when St. Cyprian who liv'd not much further, from the last of the Apostles, than we do from the first Reformers in Scotland: Then surely St. Cyprian's account of Church Government, from the Apostles, is preferable to the conjectures or guesses of men, at this distance of time, to all the Glosses that Presbyterians put upon the Scriptures, and if these were wrong in St. Cyprian's days, whom God assisted extraordinarily, whom shall the Presbyterians pitch on, that was right in opposition to them? Or if St. Cyprian might be deceived in an Hundred and Fitty years space, for all the advantages he had to know the practices of the Apostles, may not the Presbyterians be deceived at the distance of 1600 years? & might not his Majesty say against His Antagonists *Mallet errare cum Patribus quam cum Fratribus*? I had rather Err with the Fathers than with the Brethern?

7. Besides the Scriptures, & the practice of the Ancient Church, had not the Royal Martyr the Learn'dest Reformers, and a cloud of Forreign Divines, who are friends to Presbytrie, that do highly approve of Episcopacy? For

What do our British Presbyterians think of Mr. Calvin? who says, He knows
~~not~~

not what Curse is great enough for them that would refuse a Cyprianic Bishop?

Or of Melancthon, who wish'd to God, it were in His Power to restore Bishops; For He foresaw what manner of Government they should have; and that hereafter; would grow up a greater Tyranny than ever?

Or of Tylen, a Divine in the French Church, who affirms that none ever before *Aërius*, cry'd down Episcopacie; nor yet after Him but some of Geneva? This could not have been *Isaac Causibon*, For he asserts that Episcopacie is of Divine Right. Nor, *Beza*, for he prays thus, God forbid, that there should be any of sound brains, that would consent to the Maddness of those, that would altogether Reject the Episcopal Order.

Or what do Presbyterians think of the Testimony of *George Prince Anhalt*? who became a Zealous Preacher; in a Sermon he expresses these words: *How willingly and with what gladness of Heart, would we Reverence, Obey, and yield to the Bishops, their Ordination and Jurisdiction, the which we and Luther very often protested, both by Word and Writing.*

But see with these an Heap of Testimonies, in the *Confessions of Reformed Churches for Episcopacy* being according to the word of God. The Original of the Bishops and Metropolitans, by the Reverend and Learned Arch Bishop Usher, whose Piety and Learning is acknowledged by all Presbyterians: and yet I find Doctor Pierce in his *Discoverer Discovered*, against Baxter, Page 224. Cite the said Arch-Bishop's Judgment of the Ordination of Presbyterians in Britain and Ireland, who looks on it as unlawfull and insufficient, because they are not exposed to the necessity of the want of Bishops, as Forreign Presbyterians are: It is a necessity of their own making.

I shall add to these Forreign Testimonies, for *Episcopacy*, two of our Scotch Reformers; to wit, Mr. John Durie, and Mr. John Davidson, the former Minister at Montrose, the other at the Panns.

Mr. Durie, was perswaded by Mr. Andrew Melvil, to preach up the Necessity of the Geneva Discipline, and Platform of Government there, and was very Instrumental in setting it up; but he liv'd to repent of the Success that he had in it: For, as Arch Bishop Spotswood relates, Page 458. Anno 1600, That the said John Durie, wish'd

wish'd earnestly He might have liv'd to the meeting of the Assembly, but when he perceived His Sickness increase, He Intreated some Bretheren to Visit him, and to show the Assembly as from Him, that there was a necessity of Restoring the Ancient Government of the Church, Because of the unruliness of Young Ministers, that could not be advis'd by the Elder sort, nor kept in order; and since both the Estate of the Church did require it, and that the King did labour to have the same received, he wish'd them to make no trouble therefore, and to insist only with the King, that the best Ministers, and of greatest experience, might be preferred to places.

This (as he directed) was reported to the Assembly.

The next is Mr. John Davidson, whom Mr. Durham mentions in his Book on the Revelation, for His Spirit of Prophecie; and who is wonderfully spoken of, in a Book called *Fulfilling of the Scriptures*, for his great Piety and Prophetick Spirit: Yet this same Mr. Davidson, in a Catechism, dedicate to his own Parish the Panns, has a small tractat at the end of that Catechism, which He calls, *The Burthen of a loaded Conscience*, in which He confesses and bewails,

wails, the several Failings and Follies of his Youth, Manhood, and of His *Ministry*; and gives many good instructions to all the Readers of his Book, as to Religion & Loyalty : and as to *Episcopacie*, he has these, very words, *Be obedient to Arch-Bishops and Bishops, and stand not out against them, as I have wickedly done.*

The Summ of all is, that the cause for which the King did suffer was Just, and therefore it was unjust to put him to Death: He was put to Death, by those that took away His Power and his Person; this was done by the parties that then prevailed in *Scotland* and *England*: These Parties were the Presbyterians and Independents. It is the principle of the one to rise in Arms against Him, and according to their Principle, they did so: It is the Principle of the other to bring him to Execution and according to their Principle, they did so: And it is as unlawfull to maintain the Killing of Him in a Camp, as it is to maintain the Lawfullness of bringing his person to a Scaffold: The one Partie began the Work and the other finish'd it. By putting to Death a Great King, a Learn'd Man, a Good Christian, and such a Martyr, as no National Church in the World, can

can boast of, as the Church of *England* do of King *Charles* the First.

I therefore conclude with this *Litanie*.

From the Principles and Practices of Rebels, Hereticks and Schismatics, Good Lord deliver us. *AMEN*.

F I N I S.

Majesty in Misery ;

Or an Imploration to the King of Kings ;
Written by His Majesty King *CHARLES*
the First, with His own hand, during
His Captivity in *Carisbrook Castle*, in
the Isle of *Wight*, 1648.

Great Monarch of the World, from whose Power
The Potency and Power of Kings, (springs
Record the Royal Wo my suffering sings.

And teach my Tongue that ever did confine
Its faculties in truths Seraphick Line,
To track the Treasons of thy Foes and mine.

Nature and Law by thy Divine Decree,
The only Root of Righteous Royaltie,
With this dim Diadem invested me.

With it the sacred Scepter, Purple Robe,
The Holy Unction, and the Royal Globe ;
Yet I am levell'd with the life of *Job*.

The

The fiercest furies that do daily tread
Upon my Grief; my Gray Discrowned Head,
Are those that owe my Bounty, for their Bread.

They raise a War, and Christen it, *The cause,*
Whilst Sacrilegious hands have best applause,
Plunder and Murder are the Kingdoms Laws.

Tyranny bears the Title of *Taxation,*
Revenge and Robbery are *Reformation,*
Oppression gains the name of *Sequestration,*
My Loyal Subjects who in this bad season,
Attend me, (By the Law of God and Reason)
They dare impeach and punish for High Treason.

Next at the Clergy do their Furies frown,
Pious Episcopacy must go down,
They will destroy the Crozier and the Crown.

Churchmen are chain'd, and Schismaticks are freed,
Mechanicks preach, and Holy Fathers bleed,
The Crown is Crucified with the Creed.

The Church of *England* doth all Faction foster
The Pulpit is usurpt by each Imrostor,
Extempore excludes the *Pater noster.*

The Presbyter and Independent seed,
Springs with broad blades, to make Religion bleed,
Herod and *Pontius Pilate* are agreed.

The Corner stone's misplac'd by every Pavier;
With such a Bloody Method and Behaviour,
Their Ancestors did crucify our Saviour.

My Royal Consort from whose fruitful womb,
So many Princes Legally have come,
Is forc'd in Pilgrimage to seek a Tomb.

Great *Britains* Heir is forced into *France,*
Whilst on his Fathers head his Foes advance;
Poor Child! he weeps out his Inheritance.

With

With my own Power my Majesty they wound,
In the kings name the king himself's uncrown'd;
So doth the dust destroy the Diamond.

With Propositions daily they Enchant,
My Peoples ears, such as do Reason daunt,
And the Almighty will not let me Grant.

They promise to erect my Royal stem,
To make me Great, & advance my Diadem,
If I will first fall down and worship them.

But for refusal they devour my Thrones,
Distress my Children, and destroy my Bones;
I fear they'll force me to make Bread of Stones.

My life they prize at such a slender rate,
And in my absence they draw Bills of hate,
To prove the King a Traytor to the State.

Felons obtain more Priviledg than I,
They are allow'd to answer ere they dye,
'Tis Death for me to ask the Reason, why.

But sacred Saviour, with thy words I woo
Thee to forgive, and not be bitter to
Such, as thou knowst, do not know what they do.

But since they from their Lord are so disjointed,
As to condemn those Edicts he appointed,
How can they prize the power of his Anointed?

Augment my Patience; Nullify my hate,
Preserve my issue, and Inspire my Mate.
Yet, though we perish, Bless this Church and state.

Vota dabunt quæ Bella negarunt.

An Epitaph upon King *Charles* the first.

SO falls the stately Cedar, while it stood,
 That was the only Glory of the Wood.
 Great *Charles*, Terrestrial God, Celestial Man,
 Whose life, like others, though it were a span,
 Yet in that span was comprehended more,
 Than Earth hath waters, or the Ocean shore.
 Thy Heavenly Virtues Angels should rehearse,
 It is a Theam too high for Human Verse.
 He that would know the right then, let him look
 Upon thy rare Incomparable Book,
 And read it o're, and o're: which if he do,
 He'll find thee *King*, and *P i e s t*, and *P r o p h e t* too,
 And sadly see our loss, and though in vain,
 With fruitless wishes call thee back again.
 Nor shall oblivion sit upon thy Hearse,
 Though there were neither Monument nor Verse.
 Thy Sufferings and thy Death let no man name,
 It was thy Glory, but the Kingdoms shame.

Another, Written by the Magnanimous
James Marquefs of *Montrose*, with the
 point of his Sword, upon the Sand.

12 MR 58

Great, Good, and Just could I but rate
 My Griet, and thy too rigid Fate.
 I'de weep the world to such a strain,
 That it should deluge once again.
 But since thy Loud-Tongu'd Blood demands Supplies,
 More from *Briareus* hands than *Argus* Eyes;
 I'll sing thy Elegy with Trumpers sounds,
 And write thy Epitaph in Blood and Wounds.

Montrose.

F I N I S.

t.

ous
the

lies,

ose.